

TEMPERANCE
VERSUS
PROHIBITION:

AN ADDRESS
ON THE SCOTT ACT,

BY
GOLDWIN SMITH,
President of the Liberal Temperance Union.

WITH AN APPENDIX ON ALCOHOL,

C. GORDON RICHARDSON.

PRICE, 10 CENTS.

Toronto:
PRINTED BY C. BLACKETT ROBINSON,
5 JORDAN STREET.

The EDITH *and* LORNE PIERCE
COLLECTION *of* CANADIANA



Queen's University at Kingston

TEMPERANCE

VERSUS

PROHIBITION:

AN ADDRESS

ON THE SCOTT ACT,

By GOLDWIN SMITH,

President of the Liberal Temperance Union.

WITH AN APPENDIX ON ALCOHOL,

By C. GORDON RICHARDSON.

TORONTO:

PRINTED BY C. BLACKETT ROBINSON,

5 JORDAN STREET.

PREFACE.

THE following address gives the substance of speeches delivered on several occasions in support of the policy of the Liberal Temperance Union and against that of Prohibitive legislation. In putting it forth I have had the valuable assistance of Mr. J. Gordon Mowat and of Mr. C. G. Richardson, the Secretaries of the Liberal Temperance Union, the latter of whom has favoured me with the paper appended to the Address on the scientific aspect of the subject, with which I am not competent to deal. I embrace the opportunity, as President of the Liberal Temperance Union, of expressing my gratitude to both these gentlemen, who have borne the brunt of the battle, and to whose able exposition of the case on many platforms the success of the appeal made by the Union to public opinion is largely due.

G. S.

TEMPERANCE VERSUS PROHIBITION.

It will appear, I trust, before the end of this address that its object is to promote temperance, and that it is in that interest that I oppose Prohibition. To us, not to the Prohibitionist, the name Temperance belongs. Temperance means moderate use ; Prohibition means total and enforced abstinence. Temperance, as I believe, is rational, practicable, and commended by the Gospel, while enforced abstinence is not.

With the liquor trade I have nothing to do. In England, where it is political and overweeningly strong, I fought against it as a Liberal for many years, though I always declined to commit myself in any way to Prohibition. I would ask for it nothing but justice, respect for which is the soul of the commonwealth, and which it is especially necessary to uphold in the case of those who are discredited and run down. I do not fear to stand by the side of any man who is wronged, not even if he has come out of gaol this morning ; but I fear to stand by the side of the most religious and respectable wrongdoer. Nobody in his senses can believe that men, by entering a trade which a few years ago was by none deemed disreputable, and which is licensed by the State, can have put themselves out of the pale, not only of justice, but of mercy. If their business is for public reasons to be abolished, and they are to be deprived of their livelihood, they might be thought entitled to compassion or, at the very least, to exemption from insult. But they have been treated as the vilest of criminals, and the people have been incited to deal with them as dynamiters and vermin. Native abuse not being enough, recourse has been had to the other side of the line for masters of vituperation, one of whom thought us not unworthy of the hint that, though the American constitution forbids the confiscation of private property, no such bar to legislative freebooting exists here. It is difficult to think that churches dedicated to the religion of charity can be the proper scenes of such venomous tirades. These ruthless reformers themselves make no sacrifice : to them it is a stern delight to hunt down the liquor dealers, while they drink in the cheers of enthusiastic audiences, and swell with the consciousness of superior virtue. Nor are these their only rewards. Moral reform is a marketable commodity, and

leads not only to paid lectureship and other employments in connection with the organization, but to seats in Parliament and municipal offices, which the promoters of the Scott Act have resolved shall, if their votes can do it, be made the exclusive property of their sect.*

I want to fix attention on the real issue, which has been buried under irrelevant declamation. The question is not whether intemperance is an evil, or whether alcoholic drinks are wholesome, but whether the Scott Act or any form of Prohibition does good or harm.

That intemperance is a beastly and degrading vice, bringing misery to its victim, and too often to his hapless family, is a fact of which nobody has a keener or more practical sense than the members of the "Liberal Temperance Union." It is matter to me of sincere regret that I should be severed from good men who have the repression of intemperance at heart. I comfort myself with thinking that though I differ as to the means, my endeavours are directed to the same end. There has, however, been a good deal of exaggeration with respect to the connection between intemperance and crime. The Maine prison report for 1884 says "Intemperance is not a cause of crime: it is a crime more against society and the family than against the State." It is often connected with crime; but the two usually spring from a root deeper than either, which, as the report says, is most frequently a bad home. More persons, according to the same document, come to gaol with the marks of lust on them than with the marks of intemperance. The germs of the criminal propensities are seen in the nature of all of us before the wine-cup has touched our lips. Crime varies with influences quite irrespective of drink, such as the abundance of employment, the cheapness of food, and the circumstances of localities, urban or rural. It is rife in Mahometan countries, where wine is forbidden by the Prophet's law. At one time it was supposed, and statistics seemed to prove, that illiteracy was the cause of crime, and that popular education would be the certain cure. But in this there was the same fallacy: the truth was that the illiteracy and crime had a common root in the bad home. The chaplain of a large gaol deposed before a Royal Commission, of which I was a member, that of the prisoners who entered

* The *Globe* itself says of one who till lately, at all events, was a leading champion of the cause, that "a few years ago he was a temperance man. It soon became apparent, however, that his temperance professions were so much capital to be employed to advance his political ends. The more was known of him, the less was thought of him. In Ontario his 'ten dollar' speeches have become a drug in the market."

themselves as illiterates, probably to extenuate their offences, many were found to be really able to read and write. Every offender now hopes to find mercy by flattering the prevailing notion that he was betrayed into crime by drink. It is a mistake, therefore, to suppose that if by violent and arbitrary measures we could deprive the whole community of its natural liberty in the choice of beverages we should thereby put an end to crime, or even to two-thirds of it, and get rid of police and gaols.

There have also been great—nay, monstrous—overstatements of the ravages made by alcohol in this country. It has been proclaimed on the Scott Act platform that there are seven, or even ten, thousand deaths from drinking every year, and the speaker who gave the larger figure averred that it was an underestimate. The vital statistics of Ontario show that the death-rate in this Province is eighteen per thousand. Supposing the rate to be the same for the Dominion, and the population of the Dominion to be 4,500,000, this would give 81,000 deaths annually. But the returns show that nearly fifty per cent. of the deaths occur before the age of twenty, and drunkard's graves before that age are hardly probable: they would be rare before twenty-five. There remain 40,500 persons dying at ages exceeding twenty. Half of these being women (deaths from drunkenness among whom in this country are very rare), we have 20,250 men over twenty dying annually. Does any one believe that of these one-half or one-third fill drunkard's graves? In the month of September, 1885, the number of deaths, according to the Mortuary Statistics, was, at Montreal, 1,220, at Toronto 187, at Quebec 193, at Hamilton 58, at Charlottetown 15, at Guelph 15, at Belleville 21, at Chatham 10. The number of deaths from Alcoholism was, at Toronto, 2; at the other places none. Making all allowance for medical reticence, as well as for the enhancement of the death-rate by small-pox at Montreal, it is scarcely conceivable that the proportion of deaths from Alcoholism can be such as to call for panic measures, or to warrant the withdrawal from the whole community of its natural liberty in the choice of its own drinks.

Whether alcoholic drinks are wholesome or unwholesome is a question which I leave to be decided by medical science and individual experience. Perhaps there may be a difference in our constitutions, and while a cup of tea may be better for a preacher or a lady, a glass of beer may be better for a farmer or a navy. I have no doubt that strict moderation is necessary in all cases, nor would I commend liquor to the lips of any man who finds himself as well or better without it. But that

alcohol is poison, as Prohibitionist lecturers, male and female, vehemently aver that it is, I should find it difficult to believe. Wine, or some other fermented drink, has been used by all the great nations, ancient and modern : by Greeks, Romans, Jews, British, French, and Germans. The habit is coeval with the dawn of recorded time, as the Vedic hymns, the Hebrew records, the Greek, Roman and Scandinavian mythologies show. Indeed, fermentation is so natural a process that, if its results were poison, it might almost seem a trap set by the Author of nature for His creatures. I have myself known two cases of persons who, having used wine all their lives, attained their hundredth year ; and a moderate drinker is now leading a political party in England at the age of seventy-seven. Sir Andrew Clarke, the rigid reformer of diet, admits that if a man drinks a small quantity of wine with his meal it would do him no harm in body, mind, or spirit. Sir Henry Thompson says that more physical harm comes of over-eating than of drinking, and he is inclined to think more moral harm also. It is sometimes forgotten by the crusaders against liquor that temperance and intemperance extend to meat as well as to drink. Mr. Stanley, the African explorer, recommends even for that climate a moderate quantity of wine after sunset. It is asserted that alcohol is not food. The assertion is denied ; but suppose it true. Tea and coffee are not food : tea and coffee soothe ; wine, as the Scripture says, makes glad man's heart, and the expenditure on one is no more waste than the expenditure on the other, or than the expenditure on any article of taste or luxury whatever. Much has been said by reformers of diet against tea and coffee as well as against wine and beer, and there is reason to believe that bad green tea causes fully as much bodily and mental mischief in this country as do alcoholic drinks. Yet nobody has proposed to deprive us of the liberty of drinking tea. A mania prevails just at present on this subject. There are people who refuse even to celebrate the Eucharist with wine according to Christ's ordinance, so angelically pure are they. One reformer has avowed that he hopes to see the day when the celebration of the Eucharist with wine shall be made a criminal offence. When excitement has reached this pitch it is hardly possible that the practical bearings of a very difficult question should receive cool and deliberate consideration.

It has been preached, and, as I understand, with considerable effect in rural districts, that the wine mentioned in the Gospels, and drunk by Christ and His apostles, was the unfermented juice of the grape. It is singular

that a truth so vital in the eyes of its discoverers as to have become a cardinal doctrine of Christianity should have been hidden from the Church for eighteen centuries, and revealed only when it was required to stop a gap in the argument for Prohibition. The word *oinos*, used in the Gospels, is the word invariably used in the Greek classics for wine or for other fermented drink. Can any educated and dispassionate man believe that the wine into which Christ turned water at the marriage feast, and the goodness of which the master of the feast remarked with surprise; the wine which Christ Himself "came drinking" in contrast with John, "who drank no wine or strong drink"; the wine for drinking which Christ's enemies called Him a wine-bibber; the wine which He used at the Last Supper, and with which, when used at the commemoration of that Supper, some of the Corinthian disciples were "drunken,"—was anything but fermented wine? The red colour—symbolical of Christ's blood in the Eucharist—cannot be imparted without fermentation. The sacramental wine used by punctilious Prohibitionists appears to be not the pure juice of the grape, but a concoction symbolical only of spuriousness and imposture. If drinking wine is a sin, it seems strange that the Gospel should not have condemned it altogether. It seems strange that a deacon, instead of being required not to be given to much wine, should not be required to be a total abstainer. In commenting on the miracle of Cana, Canon Farrar contrasts the "genial innocence" of Christ's system with the "crushing asceticism" of rival systems. It must be owned that Mahomet, who by virtue of his Prohibitionism is becoming a sacred personage to total abstainers, has not been so successful on the whole with his crushing asceticism as Christ with His genial innocence. The result of unnaturally repressing one appetite usually is the abnormal development of others. That persons who take Christ as their pattern, and at the same time denounce any use of wine, however moderate, as a sin, should find themselves in a dilemma is not surprising; but they will not extricate themselves by attempting to wrench from its natural meaning as plain and familiar a word as any in the Gospel. It is true the Apostle bids us not drink wine if thereby our brother stumbleth; but with drinking wine he couples eating meat, implying clearly that both in themselves are equally innocent.

But, I repeat, the question is not what are the evils of intemperance, nor what are the tendencies of alcohol, though those are the themes which furnish forth almost entirely the eloquence of the Scott Act platform. It is whether the Scott Act or any form of Prohibition does good or harm

diminishes the amount of drunkenness or increases it. And the answer to this question is not matter of conjecture or speculation. The experiment has been tried by several communities, on an ample field, for a sufficient time, under favourable conditions, and with a decisive result.

Massachusetts tried Prohibition for many years, and gave it up as worse than a failure. The Joint Committee of the Legislature, in 1867, reports that the law, if by its operation it diminishes the number of open places of drinking, does so only to multiply the secret places. The evidence, it is said, tends to show that in all those cities or towns where the prosecution against open places had been most active an extraordinary number of secret places were started, that more liquor, and worse liquor, was drunk, and that more intoxication ensued. Statistics are given showing the tendency of drunkenness to increase under the Prohibitive system. The report cites the Rev. James A. Healey, pastor of a very large Roman Catholic Church, and visiting extensively among the poorer classes, as saying that "in almost every house they had liquor, and they sell to those in the house"; Mayor Norcross as saying that "drunkenness increases"; ex-Mayor Lincoln as saying that "the sale of ardent spirits had increased faster than the population had increased." With regard to the condition of things in Boston, says the report: "It can be safely asserted that while the number of open places has undoubtedly somewhat diminished, all the principal hotels, groceries, restaurants, apothecaries, and wholesale liquor dealers sell openly, and immense and continually increasing numbers of secret places and clubs have been established, drunkenness has increased almost in direct ratio with the closing of public places, and there is now more of it than at any previous time in the history of the city."

From Cambridge, Lowell, Charlestown, New Bedford, Fall River, Worcester, Lynn, Springfield, Pittsfield, comes similar evidence given by mayors, ex-mayors, and other competent persons. "The mere fact," says the report, "that the law seeks to prevent them from drinking, rouses the determination to drink in many. The fact that the place is secret takes away the restraint which, in more public and respectable places, would keep them within temperate bounds. The fact that the business is contraband and liable to interruption, and its gains are hazardous, tends to drive honest men from it, and to leave it under the control of dishonest men who will not scruple to poison the community with vile adulteration." The practical conclusion of the Committee is, "Let the law cease to attempt to interfere arbitrarily with what a man shall drink, while, nevertheless

placing such regulations as experience has shown to be necessary over the person who may make the sale, and the time and places when and where the sale shall be made. Let it be regarded as a fact that the demand on the part of those who desire, wisely or unwisely, to use liquor as a beverage has always been met, and always will be met, by men who will sell either under the law, or in defiance of the law, and that wise legislation should recognize and act upon this fact."

In Vermont, again, they have had Prohibition for upwards of thirty years. Vermont is a rural State, without any maritime city like Portland, and with a religious and law-abiding population : as fair a field for a moral experiment as could be desired. Its Legislature has piled enactment upon enactment, penalty upon penalty, one engine of repression on another, violating at last the very sanctuary of personal liberty by giving the police power to enter the home without a warrant. But what is the practical effect of all this complication of severities? We learn from an article in the *Popular Science Monthly* of May, 1884, by Mr. Edward Johnson, whose statements I have not seen anywhere contradicted :—

"But the practical operation of this severe and sweeping law there is the rub. It is a fact which cannot be controverted or denied that, for all practical purposes, the law is an absolute dead letter. According to the returns of the United States revenue officers, the Government tax on the manufacture and sale of intoxicating liquors in the State amounted last year to fourteen thousand dollars in round numbers. On the same authority there are in the State at the present time four hundred and forty-six places where intoxicating liquors are sold ; and, though the population is well-nigh stationary, there is a marked increase in the number of these places; last year's returns showing only four hundred and twenty-six, and those for the preceding year four hundred and nine. In the city of Burlington there are about threescore places where liquor is sold, and in Rutland, St. Albans, and all the larger towns, a proportional number, and in every village in the State, with the exception of a few inconsiderable hamlets, there is at least one such place. A large proportion of the dram-shops are located upon the principal streets, and there is no concealment or attempted concealment of the illegal traffic conducted within them. As these facts and figures sufficiently indicate, the law, broadly speaking, is not at all enforced. The sale of liquor, it is hardly too much to say, is almost as free and open as though there were no such thing as a prohibitory law. The principal exception to the general rule consists of an occasional spasmodic attempt to enforce the law in the larger places, and the fining of liquor dealers on what are termed disclosures. In the latter case, a person arrested for intoxication is compelled to disclose the name of the person from whom he procured the liquor, and that person is then tried for the offence. Such cases are very common, but as only the lowest class of liquor dealers is concerned in them, generally speaking, and as the prosec

ably for a first offence, no effective purpose is served in repressing the liquor traffic. In the larger towns an effort to enforce the law is occasionally made, but such efforts have invariably proved short-lived, and in almost every instance the people have, at the earliest opportunity, rejected at the polls the officers who have attempted to enforce the law. These are the principal exceptions to the general rule of non-enforcement. Of enforcing the law as the laws against burglary and larceny are enforced no one dreams for a moment. Such is the unsatisfactory result of Vermont's thirty years' experience of the prohibitory liquor law. One might go still further, and speak of the perjury and subornation of perjury, for which the law is in a sense responsible, of the disregard and contempt for all law which the operation of this law tends to foster and encourage, and of cognate matters which will occur to the reflective reader; but, perhaps, enough has been said in showing the failure of the law to accomplish the object for which it was enacted."

The moral, according to Mr. Johnson, is that men cannot be dragooned into virtue. They cannot be dragooned into virtue, that is, by State interference with habits not in themselves criminal, but only by legislative repression of positive crime.

But the special theatre of Prohibition is Maine, where a Prohibitive law has been in existence for more than thirty years, and is now incorporated into the Constitution. What is the actual result of Maine legislation? According to "Gail Hamilton," a trustworthy local authority, in the *North American Review* for July last, "The actual result is that liquor is sold to all who wish to obtain it in nearly every town in the State. Enforcement of the law seems to have little effect. For the past six years the city of Bangor has practically enjoyed free rum. In more than one hundred places liquor is sold, and no attempt has been made to enforce the law. In Bath, Lewiston, Augusta, and other cities, no real difficulty is experienced in procuring liquor. In Portland enforcement of the law has been faithfully attempted, yet the liquor traffic flourishes for all classes from the highest to the lowest. . . . In a journey last summer for hundreds of miles through the cities and through the scattered villages and hamlets of Maine the almost universal testimony was, 'You can get liquor enough for bad purposes in bad places, but you cannot get it for good purposes in good places.'" "What works against Prohibition," adds "Gail Hamilton," "is that, in the opinion of many of the most earnest total-abstinence men, the original Maine Law State, after thirty years of Prohibition, is no more a temperance State than it was before Prohibition was introduced." With this testimony general evidence concurs, and it is supported by the Maine Prison Report for 1884, already cited, which

states "Intoxication is on the increase; some new legislation [must be made if it is to be lessened. In many of our counties Prohibition does not seem to affect or prevent it." Prisoners, the Report tells us, all say that when released, if they can get money, they can get as much drink as they please. In Portland, in 1874, the number of arrests for drunkenness was 2,318. But drunkenness is not confined to the cities. In 1876, when a more than usually vigorous crusade was made against the saloons, the number of prosecutions for infractions of the liquor law was 2,300. Every one of the sixteen counties furnished its quota. In four counties the number exceeded 200, in only two was it less than thirty. In 1884, the law generally was not so stringently enforced, but every county again furnished its quota. The number of committals to gaol for drunkenness last year was 1,316 for a population of 648,000, while in Canada the counties of Bruce, Huron, Grey, Simcoe, Dufferin, Wellington, Waterloo, Perth, Oxford, Brant, Wentworth, Lincoln, Haldimand and Welland, none of which were at that time under the Scott Act, with an aggregate population of 661,000, and a town population as large as that of Maine, showed only 593 committals, less than half the number of those in the model State of Prohibition. Maine is very far from realizing the promises of immunity from crime and vastly enhanced prosperity which Prohibitionism holds out. Though the population of the State has been stationary, the statistics of crime have increased. In 1873 the number committed to gaol was 1,548; in 1884 it was 3,072. The pauper rate in the cities is larger than in those of any other State; and between 1850 and 1880 the school attendance decreased by more than 21,000.

It is natural that General Neal Dow, for whom I wish to express all possible respect, should cling tenaciously to the work of his life. But he admits with sorrow that the cities of Maine are infested with low places for the sale of liquor, and he gives as his reason for breaking with the Republican Party its complicity with the liquor interest, which a political party would not have cared to propitiate if the interest had not been strong.

Prohibition is now being tried in Iowa. A correspondent of *Harper's*, recommended as thoroughly trustworthy by that journal, having just come from the field of experiment, reports that Prohibition in the cities means free liquor. A correspondent of the *New York Nation* states the same thing more at length, giving it as his opinion that Prohibition is not operative as a law, but only in the places where, and the degree in which,

it happens to coincide with public sentiment. He adds that the local organ of Prohibition, after giving reports from a large number of places, virtually admits its failure. Dr. Dio Lewis, who will hardly be considered licentious on a question of diet, says that he has recently been out to the Rocky Mountains, and on his way east got off the train at several of the large cities, and among other things made enquiry into the practical benefits which the public had received from the enactment of prohibitory laws. In places where he had been told that an intoxicating drink could not be obtained for love or money he saw men reeling in the streets in an almost helpless state of drunkenness. In Iowa City, where Prohibition is supposed to be enforced, he saw from seventy-five to one hundred kegs of beer delivered on trucks from a brewery. His practical conclusion was that "Prohibition was a wild theory, that as a preventive it had not met the claims of its supporters, and as an aid to the cause of temperance was a failure." "In Kansas," says "Gail Hamilton" in the article before quoted, "where the most stringent Prohibition has been enacted, and has had the inestimable advantage of Governor St. John's fostering care, Dr. Cardner testifies that the drug-stores are little more than rum shops, and that their number is astonishing. In Pittsburg, a thrifty little town of 4,000 people, he counted fifteen drug stores and twenty doctor's signs on the main street."

Prohibition, then, is not inoperative: it produces great effects, but in a direction diametrically opposite to that which its advocates desire. In the first place it destroys the licensed and regulated trade, for which it substitutes an illicit trade, carried on under no regulation, even in regard to hours, by worse men, and in worse places. In the second place it drives the people to the use of ardent spirits instead of the lighter beverages; ardent spirits, which contain a large amount of alcohol in a small bulk, being easily smuggled, whereas wine, beer, and cider, owing to their bulk, are not. In the third place, while it may diminish the number of moderate drinkers, and possibly the total amount of liquor consumed, it increases drunkenness, because clandestine drinkers are sure to be heavy drinkers, and they are sure to drink, not with their meals, but in the pernicious form of drams. In the fourth place it renders inspection impossible and stimulates adulteration, by which the illicit dealer indemnifies himself for prosecutions and for the general hazards of the trade. In the fifth place, if attempts are made to enforce it, neighbourhoods are filled with espionage and ill-blood. In the sixth place it is the fruitful parent of perjury, of which, as Baron Bramwell says, and as experience in this country already

shows, the courts in liquor cases are the special scene. A set of conventional quibbles is invented. "They called for ginger ale." "They cannot be sure that the liquor served them was whiskey and not something resembling whiskey." Ignorance is pleaded when the witness has no real doubt as to the fact. Thus conscience is enfeebled by false swearing under a thin disguise, and the very source of morality is polluted in the attempt to punish a factitious crime. Compared with these effects the loss of revenue is of small moment. Yet it is hard that the community should have its load of taxation increased in order that contrabandism, with all its attendant evils, may be substituted for a licensed trade.*

That the practical result of Prohibition, or of the Scott Act, is free trade in liquors without license fees, the low liquors dealers are perfectly well aware. The Temperance Union in the course of the campaign has found men of this class by no means disposed to resist the adoption of the Act.

Archdeacon Farrar, who was the other day our guest, and who is not only a total abstainer, but a leading champion of total abstinence, in his answer to Baron Bramwell in the *Fortnightly Review*, emphatically repudiates as uncharitable and absurd the doctrine that there is anything morally wrong in the use of fermented liquor. He says that he has never preached abstinence as a matter of duty even to confirmation classes or to national schools. He admits that moderate drinking is a perfectly lawful enjoyment, and that multitudes of men indulge in it who are wiser and better than he is himself. If to drink wine or beer is not morally wrong, to sell them cannot be wrong either, the two being inseparable parts of the same transaction. This the people at heart feel, and though they may be cajoled or bullied into voting for the law, they afterwards refuse to support its enforcement. In the case of any real crime, such as murder or theft, men are ready to aid authority, but they are not ready to play the informer against a neighbour, and help to send him to prison for that which they do not believe to be a crime at all. In truth they would be sneaks if they were.

We are told that we must obey the law. Obey the law, of course, we must; but we are not bound to take an active part in enforcing it if we believe it to be unjust, still less if we believe its enactment to be an abuse of the franchise, which is given to men to secure their own rights and lib-

* It seems that the use of opium is greatly increasing in the Eastern cities of the United States. May not this be connected with the ascetic renunciation of alcoholic drinks?

erties against encroachment, not to enable them to encroach on the rights and liberties of others.

It is plausibly contended that Prohibition, at all events, does away with open temptation. The evidence appears hardly to bear out this statement; while, on the other hand, clandestine drinking certainly is more systematic, is carried on, so to speak, more with *malice prepense*, and the men into whose hands the illicit trade falls often make it their business to go about thrusting temptation on passengers, particularly on the young.

When I am solemnly warned of the terrible responsibility which I incur as President of the Temperance Union by opposing the Scott Act, I must answer that if my critics are willing to incur the responsibility of increasing drunkenness, and of filling the community with ill-blood and perjury at the same time, I am willing to bear what I think the less terrible responsibility of trying to diminish drunkenness by the mild but practical methods of the Temperance Union. If the goodness of the end were always a guarantee for the wisdom of the means and the character of the result, no doubt the advocates of the Scott Act would be in the right, and to challenge their foresight and sagacity would be wrong. Unhappily, it is quite otherwise, as the history of many a reformatory enactment framed with the most benevolent intentions shows.

The Prohibition policy has been tried in the Old Country in the shape of a Sunday Closing Act, imposed on some parts of Ireland and on Wales. If we may trust an article by Mr. Agg. Gardner, in the *Fortnightly Review*, August, 1884, the result has been disastrous. In Wales, he says, the Act had been in force for six months only when the evil effects became apparent. The inspector of the Cardiff police shows an increase of forty per cent. in prosecutions, and of sixty per cent. in convictions, the primary cause of which, he states, is that a number of clubs have been established, and the illicit drinking has been carried on to a great extent. The inspector of Routh reports that previous to the Act there was very little Sunday drinking, or annoyance caused by the people leaving the public-houses, but that since the Act has been passed all his energies are required to keep order in the streets. In Wrexham the mayor observed at petty sessions that the Sunday Closing Act had trebled the charges of Sunday drunkenness, and the remark was corroborated by the chief inspector of police. A prominent member of a total abstinence society at Cardiff confessed that he had signed a petition in favour of Sunday closing in Wales, but his experience had changed his opinion, and he now felt that

no Act of Parliament could make people sober ; and a Roman Catholic priest, who was a member of the same society, after deploring the pernicious action of the drinking clubs which the Act had called into existence, pronounces "that if it were repealed, as repealed it must be, things would get better": he adds that "there was more drinking, more sin, more iniquity of every kind committed in Cardiff, than ever there was before."

Nor is the policy or its failure so novel as may be supposed. In the Statutes of the Realm will be found a series of Acts of Parliament, passed under the first two Stuarts, for the prevention of "tippling." The power of the Government at that time was great, and in this matter the Puritan Parliament would heartily second the king. Yet it plainly appears that the attempt was abortive, or effective only in lowering the character of the tavern-keepers. The last act of the series ordains flogging as a penalty on the ground that the tavern-keepers were unable to pay fines.

It is needless to refer to the sumptuary laws passed by the Romans for the restraint of expenditure and for the discouragement of luxury, which evidently were total failures. No better success attended the sumptuary laws of the middle ages, enacted partly to keep up distinctions of classes, but partly, as Mr. Hallam says, in deference to "the severe and injudicious theory of religion disseminated by the clergy." That clergy was Roman Catholic, but severe and injudicious theories of religion are not confined to a single denomination.

The experiment of the Scott Act in this country is comparatively recent, and it is at first, while the zeal of supporters is still glowing, that the greatest efforts to enforce the Act are likely to be made. Yet such information as comes to me seems to show that the success of prohibitive legislation here is likely to be no better than it has been in Massachusetts, Maine, and Vermont. At St. Catharines the friends of the Scott Act confidently expected a substantial majority. But before the polling day three leading citizens visited Woodstock and Milton, where the Act was in force, and upon their report of what they had seen and heard, the Act was rejected at St. Catharines by an overwhelming majority, a smaller number of persons voting for it than had signed the petition. It appeared that the number of the places in which liquor was sold in Woodstock had increased, that they were largely frequented, especially by young men, and were sometimes crowded till two or three o'clock in the morning. Whiskey seemed also to be supplanting lager. All this was in spite of a vexatious system of espionage and prosecutions fruitful in perjury. The following

letters received by Mr. J. Gordon Mowat, Secretary of the Liberal Temperance Union, in reply to inquiries respecting the working of the Scott Act in the town of Woodstock and county of Oxford will speak for themselves. The inquiries, it should be said, were made in consequence of the circulation by the Rev. W. A. McKay, of Woodstock, of an assertion that the Scott Act was successful :—

From Mr. John Head, Dry Goods Merchant, and a leading adherent of Rev. W. A. McKay's church :

DEAR SIR,—It is almost useless to try to refute the statements of some reverend gentlemen abroad, because their cloth and standing gives their statements a colour that the truth coming from an unbiassed mind is taken with a grain of salt by a certain portion of the general public. However, to be brief, I have no hesitancy in saying that there has been more whiskey drunk in this county since the 1st of May last than in any other six months of the time I have resided here. It was a very uncommon thing to see a drunken man on our streets till the Act came into force, but now it is very uncommon if we do not see from six to sixteen in a day. This is not all the work of the hotel-keepers. It is an easy matter to get liquor in twenty places outside of hotels in our town, and should you, in your travels, find any one who is not willing to accept this as truth, send him to me, and if I can't convince him of the correctness of the statement, I will pay his expenses and give him one hundred dollars, of course on the understanding that no prosecutions shall be made under these observations.

Yours truly,

JOHN HEAD.

WOODSTOCK, Nov. 10, 1885.

From Mr. John White, one of the foremost merchants in the County of Oxford :

DEAR SIR,—In answer to your inquiry, I would beg to say that I have not examined the working of the Act personally, but from the general expressions of the community, and any evidence I have gathered, I believe the Act so far has not worked satisfactorily, and I question whether it can ever be enforced so as to suppress the selling of whiskey without a large force of special detectives, as there appears to be a great hesitancy on the part of citizens and others to give any information which would convict those selling the liquor, and no doubt every case tried under the Act has given rise to a great deal of false swearing, which is very demoralizing.

I am, yours truly,

JOHN WHITE.

WOODSTOCK, 13th Nov., 1885.

From Wm. Grey, President of the Oxford Permanent Loan and Savings Society:

WOODSTOCK, Nov. 13, 1885.

MY DEAR SIR,—I am sorry I cannot be with you at your meeting, as I am thoroughly in accord with the acts and views of the Union, as I believe their action will have the desirable effect of promoting temperance, which the Scott Act in our town has not done. I have every reason to believe that a larger quantity of intoxicating and adulterated liquor is drunk now than before the Scott Act was passed; but this is not the most objectionable feature in the matter, but the false swearing at our courts when the question of a violation of this Act is tried, and the arbitrary action of the supporters of the Act.

Yours truly,

WM. GREY.

From Dr. Thrall, a leading Physician of Woodstock:

WOODSTOCK, Nov. 10th, 1885.

DEAR SIR,—With reference to your inquiries of me in regard to the working of the Scott Act in the County of Oxford, I would say that its want of observance must be apparent to every one, and I think that no candid person can know or feel otherwise. From my own observation, and the most trustworthy information privately and publicly received, I am satisfied that the most extensive illicit traffic prevails in Woodstock, and that the abuse of intoxicating liquors is greatly on the increase here, and that there is a lamentable increase of drinking among the younger men of the community.

Yours truly,

J. H. THRALL.

The County of Halton is famous in the annals of the contest about the Scott Act. In Milton, its county town, the visitors from St. Catharines found the effects of the Act, after a trial of three years and a half, much the same as its effects in Woodstock. The population of the town is only 1,400. Before the adoption of the Act there were but five places in which liquor was sold: there are now no fewer than sixteen, and owing to the prosecutions of the hotels the traffic is being thrown into the lowest and worst hands. Before the passing of the Act lager was displacing whiskey, now whiskey is supplanting lager; and the whiskey is sometimes the product of illicit stills and of the vilest kind. There, too, the sneaking habits of clandestine drinkers have been introduced, and perjury is rife. To these facts there is the testimony, not only of the visitors from St. Catharines, but of other visitors, of the Rev. W. J. Mackenzie, a clergyman of the place, and of forty-eight business men and town officials, including the

Mayor and Chief Constable, who have signed a declaration on the subject. The declaration states that in the opinion of those by whom it is signed "the Act has signally failed to reduce intemperance ; that the trade, instead of being in respectable hands as formerly, is now in those of bottle hawkers and keepers of low dens ; that the effect of the Act has been the substitution, to a great extent, of spirituous liquors for malt, wine, or cider as beverages ; that drunkenness, lawlessness and perjury are much more prevalent than they were under license ; that the Scott Act instead of removing temptation from the young, has had the contrary effect, and that in consequence cases of juvenile drunkenness have become shockingly frequent."

From other towns and districts which have adopted the Scott Act similar testimony comes. At Fredericton, according to the *Maritime Farmer*, a journal neutral on these questions, the sale of liquor is perfectly open. The *Bruce Herald* reports the Act in that county "dead as Julius Cæsar"; adding that the idea that the law would be sustained by reverence for authority soon vanished, and that prosecutions have failed from the unwillingness of witnesses to give evidence against the hotel-keepers, who have public sympathy on their side, the people feeling that the Act sought to destroy a business and confiscate property, erected under the sanction of previous laws.

Much stress has been laid on the failure of the attempt to repeal the Act in Halton. But it must be remembered that at that time no Temperance platform other than the Scott Act had been offered to the people, nor was there any opposition independent of the Trade ; the battle was fought entirely between the Prohibitionists, with an organization unimpaired in force, and the Liquor Interest, the local representatives of which had been degraded, as we have seen, by the operation of the Act.

Halton, like other rural counties, has always enjoyed a comparative freedom from serious crimes. In Prince Edward County, which rejected the Act, the Inspector in 1884 found no prisoners in gaol. In Haldimand, which also rejected the Act, the white gloves have been presented to the judge three times in succession, while the Inspector found only one prisoner in gaol on the occasion of his first visit in 1884, and only four on the occasion of his second visit ; a total of five for the two visits, against six in Halton. Even the manufacturing county of Waterloo, which is not under the Scott Act, with more than twice the population of Halton, sums up but seven prisoners in gaol on the occasion of the Inspector's visits, while

its record of convictions is smaller in proportion than that of Halton. The real inference to be drawn from these facts is that the country in general is moral, and is in no need of any violent and arbitrary legislation. In the County of Bruce, which is under the Scott Act, the last docket was particularly large.

What then is to be done? I must answer that my faith is fixed first of all on the natural and unforced influences, of which the church, the school, the Christian home, the enlightened community, and last, not least, the oracles of medical science, are the organs. The effects wrought by these influences, unlike those wrought by legislative coercion, are purely good, free from all drawbacks, connected with the general strengthening of the character and sure to be lasting. In the habits of the wealthy class in England during the last half century a marvellous improvement has taken place, not only without coercive legislation, but in spite of the temptation presented by unlimited command of the richest liquors. Canon Farrar is able exultingly to count his total abstainers in England by the myriad, and all this is the fruit of freedom. Every old inhabitant of this country testifies to a spontaneous reform of the same kind, and says that the time was when excess was deemed a point of hospitality, and the Canadian farmer often went home drunk from market, whereas now our farmers are almost universally temperate, and excess even in the great cities is comparatively rare. If a distinction could be made between the native Canadian and the emigrant, Canada's bill of moral health, it is believed, would be cleaner still.

Still we need not renounce the aid of rational legislation. Suddenly to eradicate or revolutionize the tastes and habits of mankind by legislative fiat, experience has shown to be hopeless; but that which cannot be eradicated or revolutionized may yet be modified and directed. The chief evil is the use of ardent spirits, especially in the form of drams, against the habit of drinking which—leading, as it does, morally and physically, to the charnel-house—all members of the Liberal Temperance Union are bound earnestly to set their faces, as they are also to use their influence against the low and pernicious habit of treating, which seems now to be dying out. It is possible, by a differential system of licenses, and by direct legislation, to discriminate against ardent spirits, and in favour of the lighter and more wholesome beverages, such as native wine, beer, and cider; thus reversing the evil action of Prohibition, which, as we have seen, practically enforces the use of ardent spirits to the exclusion of the lighter drinks. It is found that in the wine-growing districts of Europe, where the native wine is regularly

taken by the people with their meals, drunkenness is rare. The Spaniards are noted for their temperance. Croker says in his "Travels in Spain": "The habitual temperance of these people is really astonishing. I never saw a Spaniard drink a second glass of wine." Another English tourist in Spain says: "In all our wanderings through town and country, along the highways and byways of the land, from Bayonne to Gibraltar, we never saw more than four men who were the least intoxicated." Mr. Cullen Bryant also says: "With regard to the use of wine, I can confirm all that has been said of Spanish sobriety and moderation."* A friend tells me that he has seen a crowd leave a Spanish race-course to gaze at a sight so novel as a drunken man. In the parts of Germany also where light beer is the common drink intoxication is very rare. The case is different, of course, in the great cities of France and Germany, where the use of spirits prevails. In the United States of late years the production of native wine has greatly increased, and it appears that the consumption of whiskey has at the same time declined. That the moderate use of wine must necessarily lead to excess and ultimately to the use of stronger drinks is vehemently asserted by Prohibitionists in face of the facts just mentioned, as well as of the fact that British gentlemen take a glass or two of wine every day with their dinner, yet never know what intoxication is. But the only fatal necessity in the case appears to be that of providing reasons, plausible if not true, for coercive legislation. If the ignorant Spanish peasant can use his liberty without abusing it, an educated Canadian may surely be trusted to do the same. But there are some excellent people who seem unable to recognize the existence of self-control in any breast but their own. In the course of this discussion, I heard a clerical advocate of the Scott Act say that he would no more think of putting liquor within reach of the people than of putting a knife into the hands of a baby. The weak point of his analogy was that, supposing a glass of wine or beer to be a knife, his fellow-citizens were not babies. That the use of beer is not moral and physical ruin, the worth and prosperity of our own German population in Waterloo County are sufficient proof, and if the German beverage is to be banished, we are likely to turn away from Canada a most desirable immigration.

We are assured on good authority that in certain districts of this country the vine may be cultivated, and wine may be made with profit.

*I am indebted for these quotations to Governor Andrew, who gives them in his Argument on the Errors of Prohibition.

A wholesome beverage would thus be introduced, and we should be enriched at the same time by a new agricultural industry, of which, exposed as our wheat-growers will henceforth be to the competition of the North-West, we are likely to stand much in need. Prohibition not only prevents the production of wine, but injures the trade in barley.

Another legislative measure of a reasonable kind too would be one providing for strict inspection of liquors. It is believed that the corrosion of the stomach, which engenders the fatal craving, is largely due to the adulterations of liquors with pernicious ingredients.

Whatever may seem expedient in the regulation of places of entertainment and of license fees falls likewise within the scope of the Temperance Union. In the United States the system of high licenses seems to be more and more superseding Prohibition in the public mind as a practical solution of the problem.

Nor does the Liberal Temperance Union renounce the hope of receiving valuable assistance in the repression of abuses from the heads of the trade itself. If all liquor-dealers and hotel-keepers were fiends in human shape, and steeped, as the Prohibitionist orator from Nebraska says, up to their elbows in the life-blood of civilization, it would, of course, be useless to look to them for support. But the fact is that the respectable liquor-dealers and hotel-keepers are as little desirous of encouraging drunkenness, which to the hotel-keeper is the greatest of all nuisances, as is the honourable gentleman from Nebraska himself.

There is just now, in certain quarters, a disposition to renounce liberty as selfish isolation, and to invoke the paternal despotism of the state. What is called state socialism, in other words, is the fancy of the hour, and its principles have been largely imported into this discussion by the advocates of coercive legislation. Milton, the grand apostle of liberty, did not conceive of it as a selfish isolation. He dedicated himself through his whole life with the most ardent devotion to a public cause, and deliberately sacrificed his eye sight to the service of the state. What he desired was freedom of self-development. In freedom of self-development is necessarily involved the possibility of going astray. But under what other conditions has any real and lasting improvement in human life and character ever been made?

The Jesuits built up in Paraguay a model government of the paternal kind, under which the people were guided in every action of their lives like a flock of sheep. But what became of the paternal government of

Paraguay? What becomes of model villages, and all the beneficent attempts which are made to establish adult baby-houses and exclude temptation from their happy precincts? No man can really be isolated. Every man is a part of the social organism, and subject to all its moral influences. It has been already mentioned that in the matter of drink those influences have, without abridgment of liberty, wrought an immense change.

We might be ready to resign our freedom of choice in regard to meat, drink, clothes, with other matters of individual concern, and put ourselves into the leading-strings of the state, if we could believe that the state was a perfect and good being enthroned above the heads of us all. But what is the state under the elective system of government? It is nothing but the majority for the time being. Perhaps it is a majority of one. In Fredericton it is a majority of thirteen by which, the other day, the yoke of the Scott Act was again riveted on the neck of a divided community. Nay, that which practically exercises the power of the state is often not a majority at all, but a compact and pushing minority. It is one of the great dangers of our elective system that such a minority may, by disregarding all other public interests, and devoting its forces exclusively to the promotion of its own sectarian object, override the convictions of the majority, and usurp the control of legislation. The promoters of the Scott Act are a minority, and they know it. They have vehemently refused the requirement of an absolute majority of a whole constituency, though it is manifest both that nothing less than an absolute majority ought to have the power of imposing a restriction on private habits, and that, unless there is the preponderance of sentiment in favour of the restriction which such a majority denotes, there can be no little hope of the enforcement of the law. Members of Parliament have evidently been intimidated by the Scott Act vote, and forced to support the measure, which, had the legislature been allowed to decide with freedom, would almost certainly have been rejected, or divested of its rigour by amendments. It is a crime to drink or sell a glass of wine or beer: it is no crime to force a public man by threats to vote against his conscience. In the constituencies the elections have been carried by the pressure of an organization well supplied with funds and campaign apparatus of every kind, as well as backed by the influence of certain churches, while on the other side were total lack of organization, apathy engendered partly by the belief that the Act when adopted would be inoperative, and a fear of ecclesiastical anathema, to say nothing of the fear of boycotting, to which in

so sacred a cause it was thought not unlawful to threaten. But the vote was almost everywhere light, and it was by a minority, usually a small minority, of the constituency that the adoption of the Act was carried. In an aggregate of counties, of which the total electorate is 398,764, the total number of votes cast for the Scott Act was only 123,580, more than two-fifths of the electors having stayed at home. Those who thus abstained from voting cannot have been in favour of the law: at all events they cannot have reached that degree of conviction which alone will justify a man in imposing a restriction upon the tastes and habits of his neighbours.

A wave of apparent prohibition thus swept over the country. It rolled on victoriously, so long as the only opposition made to it was that of the liquor interest. But as soon as an independent opposition made its appearance, the tide began to turn, men ventured to follow their real convictions, and of late the Scott Act has suffered crushing defeats.

My experience of the campaign has impressed me with the belief that this is at bottom largely a struggle for social freedom against the preachers and ecclesiastical organization of a powerful church. No one has a more profound respect than I have for the ministers of religion within their proper sphere. But my forefathers burst the bonds of clerical domination. In the interest of religion itself, which can only suffer by being connected with usurpation, I deprecate the reimposition of the chain. I cannot help thinking that even in the eyes of people who care little about fermented drinks there would be a prejudice against Canada as a domicile if, instead of being a free country, she were to become the domain of clerical despotism and blue laws.

In the Scott Act itself there are things which tyrannical zeal has penned, which the traditions of British justice repudiate, and against which freedom and right protest. There is a clause (121) providing that it shall not be necessary that the informer shall depose to the offence having been committed in his presence or to his certain knowledge, but that the magistrate, so soon as it appears to him that the circumstances in evidence sufficiently establish the infraction of the law, shall put the defendant on his defence, and in default of his rebuttal of such evidence shall convict him accordingly—convict him, in short, and send him to prison on mere hearsay if, in the opinion of the magistrate, who may be a vehement partisan of the Scott Act, he fails to prove his innocence. There is a clause (122) requiring a man when interrogated respecting previous conviction to criminate himself. Worst of all, there is a clause (123) compelling husband and wife to give evidence against each other. When the wife has sent the

husband, or the husband the wife, to prison, what is it supposed that thenceforward the wedlock of that pair will be? I would fain ask any Methodist divine which of the two would be the greater sin: to break the marriage vow, by which a man binds himself to cherish and protect his wife, or to refuse to give evidence under this unnatural law? In all countries and ages fanaticism has been the same. In pursuit of the engrossing object it has always ruthlessly trampled down not only all competing interests, but the laws of morality and affection.

As public sentiment fails to sustain the Act, special magistrates of approved zeal are to be sent into every county to enforce it. It signifies nothing by what name tyranny is called, or in what garb it is arrayed. For my part I would as soon be paying ship-money to the Stuarts as allow my private life and my home to be invaded by the familiars of a coercive inquisition.

We are told that Prohibition is the cause of God, and, therefore, we must support it. But how often in the course of history have men, and even good men, mistaken their self-will and their own tyrannical fancy for the cause of God? We submit that the policy of the Liberal Temperance Union is practically the best; and what is practically the best for man is the ordinance and the cause of God.

APPENDIX TO ADDRESS.

ALCOHOL.

BY MR. C. GORDON RICHARDSON.

ORGANIZATIONS having their origin in benevolence, wisdom, and philanthropy are often led into positions both absurd and dangerous. In no case has this tendency been more marked than in the so-called temperance movement. Commencing with the commendable desire of reclaiming drunkards, it has culminated in attacking the moderate drinker. Starting with a disapproval of excess it has reached a condemnation of use in any form or quantity. To bolster up this extreme position, assertions as to the nature and effects of alcohol have been made by teetotal lecturers, and circulated in their publications, until a large class of persons have come to firmly believe them. Nor need surprise be felt at the somewhat divergent opinions held upon the question by the members of a profession which of all others should be most competent to decide upon its merits. Dr. Oliver Wendell Holmes once said "that medicine, professedly founded upon observation, is as sensitive to outside influences, political, religious, philosophical, imaginative, as is the barometer to changes in atmospheric density."

But the fact is that there are very few, at the present day, of the medical profession who favour the extreme position of the Prohibitionists, and the few who do are mostly unknown to fame, or apparently ignore the many experiments conducted some years ago with the view of settling the question. Although the conclusions arrived at by these experiments have been formally accepted by science, Prohibitionists still reiterate the exploded theories of forty years since. In regard to the statement that alcohol is not a food, they base their assertion upon an old hypothesis of Baron Liebig's, and the long rejected experiments and conclusions of three French chemists, MM. Lallemand, Perrin, and Duroy. Liebig's hypothesis was this: that only those principles which contained the element nitrogen could be considered true foods. The doctrine further presumed that all muscular action involved the destruction of muscular tissue: for instance, when a certain weight is lifted by the hand a certain amount of tissue is disintegrated or destroyed. Now, since the greater part of the body is built up of nitrogenous matter, any loss or disintegration must of necessity be replaced by principles containing this essential element, and as alcohol does not contain nitrogen, Liebig could not regard it as possessing any alimentary value. For identically the same reason he rejected all the starches, fats, and other kindred

bodies. We may point out here that Liebig divided the ingesta into two great classes—nitrogenous and non-nitrogenous. The former he considered the true foods, since they were, according to his theory, the only class capable of building up the system, and supplying the material for energy or force. The latter he considered as simply heat-producers, or, as they are now termed, calorificants. This classification is still adhered to, though the same importance is no longer attached to it. The reasons in brief for the rejection of Liebig's theory are subjoined.

If muscular action involves the destruction of muscular tissue, then the amount of such destruction must bear a proportion to the amount of work expended. The principal channel by which disorganized nitrogenous material escapes from the system is the kidneys, through which it passes in the form of urea.

Now, chemists in Liebig's time were wont to assert that the amount of urea eliminated bore a direct relation to the amount of work expended. For this assertion there was no experimental data, since the methods for estimating nitrogen in combination were crude. Liebig, in fact, based it upon simple chemical generalization. Later on, when the methods of analysis were perfected, chemists found that so far from the amount of nitrogenous matter disorganized and eliminated from the system bearing any ratio to the amount of work expended, the very reverse was the case. Hence, then, nitrogenous matter could not be the source of muscular force.

At this juncture Grove enunciated the doctrine of the "Correlation of the Physical Forces." The position sought to be maintained, and now thoroughly accepted, was that heat, light, sound, magnetism, and electricity are mutually interchangeable: that one may produce either or all of the others. This is now plain to any one's comprehension. In these days we see the coal shovelled into the engine yielding by oxidation heat. This heat is converted into rotary motion—this again is, by means of shafting, etc., conveyed to the dynamo-electric machine, where it is converted into magnetism and electricity. This latter is then conveyed to the lamps which to-day illuminate many of our public streets, and is there manifested as light invariably accompanied by heat, and in some cases sound. We can, therefore, understand why the chemists of the present day, when it was decisively proved that the nitrogenous principles were not the source of muscular energy, were led to regard the fats, starches and other oxidizable bodies as being the true source. But how? Simply by becoming oxidized in the system, thereby yielding heat, which is converted by means of the animal engine, the muscles, etc., into force and energy.

That alcohol was thus oxidized and destroyed in the system was thoroughly accepted in Liebig's time. Liebig indeed ranked it second only to the fats as a heat-producer. A reaction was started by the announcement by MM. Lallemand, Perrin, and Duroy that they had discovered alcohol unchanged in the secretions of the body: were this the case then, according to modern theories, alcohol could no longer be considered as possessing any elementary value.

Many eminent chemists, including Drs. Parkes, Wollowicz, Anstie, Dupré, and Thudichum, set themselves the task of deciding by direct experiment this most important question. After a series of experiments, numbering several hundred, and extending over some years, they decided

against the earlier observers, for the following reasons:—First, the unreliability of the test used, owing in the main to its extreme delicacy. It is only when an excessive quantity has been taken that the escape of alcohol from the body can be detected by any of the ordinary methods, and, as they pointed out, the quantity escaping might easily be overestimated by reason of the delicacy of the chromic acid reaction—the test employed by the French observers. Again, the alcoholic reaction had been yielded by it in the case of a man who had not taken alcohol for twenty-six days previously, and also in the perspiration taken from the arm of a confirmed teetotaler. They also show that it is only a minute fraction of the quantity taken which escapes unchanged. “Considering the diffusible nature of alcohol,” says Dr. Pavy,* “it is not inconsistent that a small portion should escape, and that the article should form a utilizable agent in the body.” Communications have since been published in the “Proceedings of the Royal Society”† giving the results of Dr. Dupré’s experiments.

The doctor starts with the proposition that “obviously three results may follow the ingestion of alcohol. All the alcohol may be oxidized and none be eliminated; a portion only be oxidized and the rest eliminated unaltered; or lastly, all may be eliminated again unaltered. Assuming the last to be the case, it would follow that if a certain quantity of alcohol were taken daily the amount eliminated would increase from day to day until at last the amount eliminated would equal the daily consumption. It follows,” aptly remarks the doctor, “that if this theory were correct the quantity eliminated daily should be measured by ounces instead of grains.” “If, on the other hand, all the alcohol is consumed daily, no increase in the elimination will result from a continuation of the alcohol diet.”

Now, from the results obtained from a series of masterly experiments, Dr. Dupré sums up as follows:—“The amount of alcohol eliminated per day does not increase with the continuation of the alcohol diet; therefore all the alcohol consumed daily must of necessity be disposed of daily, and as it is certainly not eliminated within that time, it must be destroyed in the system.” “The elimination of alcohol following the ingestion of a dose, or doses of alcohol, ceases in from nine to twenty-four hours after the last dose has been taken.” “The amount of alcohol eliminated, in both breath and urine, is a minute fraction only of the amount of alcohol taken.”

Some twelve years ago an article appeared in the *Practitioner*‡ from the pen of the late Dr. Anstie. In accordance with the preceding quotations, evidence is adduced which proves that only a fractional portion of the alcohol taken is eliminated through the many channels of the body. “These experiments,” says Dr. Anstie, “certainly furnish us with a final and conclusive demonstration of the correctness of Dr. Dupré’s arguments against the possibility of material *accumulation* of alcohol in the body.”

“From a review of the evidence as it at present stands,” says Dr. Pavy, “it may reasonably be inferred that there is sufficient before us to justify

* “Food and Dietetics,” p. 84, London, 1874.

† On the Elimination of Alcohol, Proc. Royal Society, No. 131, p. 107, 1872, and No. 133, p. 268, 1872.

‡ *Practitioner*, p. 15, July, 1874.

the conclusion that the main portion of alcohol ingested becomes destroyed within the system, and, if this be the case, it may be fairly assumed that the destruction is attended with oxidation and a corresponding liberation of force.”*

Another favourite assertion of the teetotallers is that “because alcohol is poisonous in excessive quantities it must of necessity be injurious in small doses.” It would fare ill with humanity if this logic were sound, for it can readily be shown that there is nothing in the nature of an alimentary principle which is not injurious in excessive quantities. Salt, an article indispensable to the sustenance of life, is, when taken in excess, a virulent poison. Orfila mentions several cases of death by its agency. Vinegar, mustard, pepper, tea, coffee, all contain principles which, taken in excess, are poisonous, and if the above logic were sound their use would be highly reprehensible. To show the lengths to which some even clever medical men will go in support of a whimsical theory, the writer might state that he had in his possession a pamphlet by a physician entitled “Salt, the Forbidden Fruit,” in which it was endeavoured to be shown that all the ills to which flesh is heir to were to be attributed to the use of this “most pernicious drug.” Basing any reasons for abstinence upon the fact of its being termed a “stimulant-narcotic” is equally absurd. Everyone has noticed the stimulating effects of a moderate meal taken when hungry, and the general feeling of inability for exertion, and disposition to sleep experienced upon taking an inordinately heavy one, and if the tendency to sleep be indulged in the probability of awaking with a bilious headache. These latter are the narcotic effects of an excessive quantity of ordinary food, so that the difference between stimulation and narcotism is one of quantity only. “All foods,” says Dr. Anstie, “are ‘stimulant-narcotics.’”

Quite recently a sensation was sought to be created by the introduction into a Presbyterian pulpit one Sabbath of a Scott Act lecturer (not a clergyman) for the purpose of conducting some *interesting experiments* upon the “effects” of alcohol. One of these experiments was the precipitation of albumen (white of egg) by means of alcohol, “thereby cooking it,” according to the lecturer. But the gentleman failed to inform the good ladies and elders of this highly edified congregation that the innocent tea upon which they had no doubt regaled themselves just previously would have had precisely the same effect.

Then as to the assertion of a “reaction” following the taking of a dose of alcohol, and that a renewal and increase in the quantity becomes a necessity. There is no more “reaction” following the ingestion of a proper quantity than the analogous feeling of hunger which follows the full and complete digestion of an ordinary meal. What has been termed the “reaction” has been proved by Dr. Anstie to be the *direct* effects of a “narcotic” quantity. As to the necessity of increasing the dose, this would be serious were there any foundation for the assertion, but Dr. Anstie has also shown that it is only those who have *habituated* themselves to the “narcotic” effects of excessive quantities who are obliged to increase the quantity.

* “Food and Dietetics,” p. 85.

Much of the harm which results from excessive drinking arises from the use of distilled spirits. These drinks approximate too nearly to the active principle, alcohol, to be taken as ordinary beverages. There is as little sense in their use for this purpose as there would be in a person habitually using acetic acid in the place of vinegar; oil of mustard for the ordinary condiment; nicotine for tobacco; or theine and caffeine for tea or coffee. Nature has placed a limit upon the alcoholic strength of fermented liquors, and were men content to follow her guidance, and avoid excesses, harm would rarely, if ever, ensue.

As to the ability of the individual to exist without the use of "stimulants," "It is idle to urge," says Dr. Anstie, "that the subject of a carefully prepared experiment can be made to live in apparent health without the use of those substances vulgarly called 'narcotics,' if the practical fact be that *nations* cannot, and never have been, able to do without them." There is absolutely no period of history—there is absolutely no nation upon earth—in which indisputable evidence of their use may not be found. Von Bibra puts the matter roughly but plainly:

"Coffee leaves are taken, in the form of infusion, by two millions of the world's inhabitants.

"Paraguay tea is taken by ten millions.

"Coca by as many.

"Chicory, either pure or mixed with coffee, by forty.

"Cacao by fifty.

"Haschish is eaten and smoked by three hundred millions.

"Opium by four hundred millions.

"Chinese tea is drunk by five hundred millions.

"Finally, all known nations of the world are addicted to the use of tobacco, either by smoking, chewing, or snuffing."*

Professor Johnson† also shows that there is no considerable tract of the earth's surface without some special indigenous plant of which the natives readily avail themselves, not merely for medicinal purposes but for everyday life. If, then, the use, in some form, of "stimulant-narcotics" is indispensable to everyday life—and this important fact cannot too often be pointed out and emphasized—to what should we turn were alcohol and tobacco—articles becoming more coupled every day for opprobrium—to be entirely prohibited, and that prohibition, as many of its advocates fondly hope and expect, successfully carried out and enforced? To what many perhaps may consider less injurious ones, tea and coffee? It is, to say the least, doubtful. Much more likely to opium, as was the case during a successful (?) temperance agitation in Manchester and the Midland Counties: or to ether, as occurred in Ireland shortly after the celebrated Father Mathew campaign. Even were it so, and tea and coffee to take the place of the stronger beverages, such as light native wines and beer, we are not so certain that the change would be really beneficial to the general health of the community.

We hear much of the "cup which," in language of poetical fancy, "cheers but not inebriates." Both tea and coffee are intoxicants when taken in

* "Narcotischen Genussmittel und der Mensch"—Preface.

† "Chemistry of Common Life."

excess, and the evil effects of their indiscriminate use and abuse on the health are scarcely less than those following the abuse of wine and beer. "Tea taken too often, or in excess," says Professor Moleschott, "produces an irritability of the nerves characterized by sleepiness, general feeling of restlessness, with twitching and trembling of the limbs. Spasmodic attacks may even arise in the cardiac region. The volatile oil of tea produces a heaviness in the head, in fact a *real intoxication*, first manifesting itself as dizziness, and finally stupefaction. Green tea produces these effects in a higher degree. Coffee taken in excess also produces intoxication, in which images, thoughts and wishes rapidly succeed each other. Dizziness follows, with sensation of anxiety and trembling, and giving way of the limbs. Finally insensibility occurs." These effects, so graphically described by Moleschott, and well known to the chemist, clearly show that serious nervous disorders would inevitably result from the excessive use of tea and coffee. Indeed, there are few physicians who have not had to prescribe total abstinence from both tea and coffee. Their evil effects upon the digestive powers are also well marked. "Tea and coffee," says the eminent authority previously quoted, "though not of themselves difficult of digestion, tend to disturb the digestion of all albuminous substances, hence promoting indigestion." Nor do their evil effects cease here. It is well known that that which affects the physical health affects likewise the mental and moral faculties. Indeed it would not be surprising to find that a connection exists between the low morality of the Chinese and the excessive use of their national beverage, leaving aside the effects of the opium habit as being of comparatively recent introduction.

The stimulus of tea, especially green tea, upon the passions of young children has been noticed by many, and few parents should permit its indiscriminate use. In confirmation of these facts we may notice the wretched health of the women of this continent—a class of inordinate tea-drinkers—decimated by nervous affections, racked by innumerable pains, afflicted with the most complicated of diseases: victims to strong green tea in the morning, strong green tea at noon, strong green tea in the evening, with numberless sips and cups between whiles from the everlasting pot on the stove.

That the above evils result from an excessive use of even genuine tea no one who has paid any attention to the subject would deny. But what of the effects of three-fourths of the tea, so-called, sold and consumed? One might as well indulge in an infusion of oak-galls, for tannic acid is the only active principle in either.

Tabes mesenterica and its allied disorders, which annually carry off thousands of our children, are rare in the wine districts of Europe, where the light clarets diluted with water take the place of tea and coffee as beverages. Dyspepsia, a common complaint upon this continent, is also comparatively rare where the light wines of the country form part of the usual diet of the people.

To the great value of light wines for dietetic purposes numberless chemists, doctors and physiologists have testified. Speaking of clarets, Dr. Pavy says, "They form an exceedingly valuable kind of stimulant, both for the healthy and the sick. There is scarcely any condition in which

they are likely to disagree. They form a most suitable *beverage* for persons of a gouty or rheumatic disposition, and also for the dyspeptic.*

The latest edition of "Chambers's Encyclopædia," a work of unquestionable authority, has the following: "As life advances, and the circulation becomes languid, wine in moderation becomes an essential, or, at all events, a valuable article of food, and even in early life the physician meets large numbers of townspeople, especially women, engaged in sedentary occupations who cannot digest the national drink, beer, which is admirably suited to our out-door labouring population, and to persons of higher life who indulge freely in open-air exercise. In such cases the beer is replaced by the more grateful beverage, tea, which, however, when taken too freely, and without sufficient food, often gives rise to a form of distressing dyspepsia, *which too often impels the sufferer to seek refuge in spirits*. In many such cases cheap wine, which may be purchased under the new tariff at from 1s. 6d. to 2s. a bottle, mixed with an equal quantity of water, will be found an excellent substitute for the beer or tea."

Did space permit, many others of equally high authority might be referred to, but the above will amply suffice to show the value of alcohol, not merely as a medicine, but as an article of everyday use. It may be objected that the wines referred to in the above are not procurable in Canada. This may once have been the case, but it is not so now. The writer has had no difficulty in procuring very good native wine of exceptional purity and fair flavour. One wine in particular, a light claret, grown the vicinity of Sandwich and costing but \$1.00 per gallon, compared favourably with the better class Bordeaux wines—and was, indeed, preferable, for, while possessing an agreeable tartness, it was without the disagreeable acidity which accompanies so many of the French clarets. These wines, diluted with an equal quantity of water, form a most grateful and wholesome beverage either for summer or winter use.

Now as to the medicinal testimony. Forty years ago the teetotallers got up a manifesto signed by two thousand of the medical men in Great Britain, recommending total abstinence from all alcoholic liquors, as tending to greatly benefit the general health. Great amusement was created by the discovery, shortly after its issue, that the majority of its signatories had signed, at or about the same time, a document setting forth the peculiar merits of one of the Burton ales, and strongly recommending its general adoption by the public as a good and highly beneficial beverage. A few years ago they got up another document: remembering the history of the earlier one they were more cautious in wording it. There was nothing in it of total abstinence. It merely stated that many persons held greatly exaggerated notions as to the value of alcohol as an article of diet. It also inculcated great moderation in prescribing it for medicinal purposes. Sir G. Burrows, then President of the Royal College of Physicians, was the first to whom it was submitted for signature. He not only signed it, but was led into permitting his name to be used in obtaining other signatories. Armed with the card of Sir George Burrows, they succeeded in obtaining

* "Food and Dietetics," p. 259.

a number of signatories, many of whom, however, afterwards stated that they had signed without inspection, trusting that what came from the president of the college would be all right. It fell into the hands of a well-known Metropolitan surgeon, who not only refused to sign, but sent a letter of remonstrance to Sir George Burrows, to the effect that he "did not see how it is possible 'immensely' to exaggerate the value of alcohol as an article of diet. I believe it to be one which is simply indispensable for the whole of that large class of persons who, while they are subject to large expenditure of nervous force, are unable to digest more than a very moderate quantity of the dietetic equivalents of alcohol, in the various forms of fat and sugar. I am, myself, among the most moderate of drinkers, and on three separate occasions have endeavoured to become a total abstainer. Each time my health gave way in the attempt, which now for some years past I have not ventured to repeat; and my experience as a practitioner has taught me that many others are in a similar case."

After a lapse of ten days the President replied that the suggestions for alteration came too late for acceptance, as the document had passed into the hands of one hundred and fifty persons. He concluded with the following paragraph, which certainly concedes everything contended: "*I entirely agree with you in the opinion you express about alcohol as an article of diet. I think to a large class of persons it is indispensable, and I know many remarkable cases in confirmation of your own experience of the attempt to abstain wholly from alcohol.*"*

One of the most amusing and ingenious shuffles by which Prohibitionists seek to evade the natural consequences of their false position is the assertion that Scripture wines were unfermented and unintoxicating. "As well might we expect to find a substitute for tea or coffee without theine or some analogous principle," says Professor Lankester, "as to find a substitute for wine without alcohol." It would be a bad thing for the doctrines of the Bible if the reasoning which is taken to warrant this assertion were sound and applied to them. The wine used in the Eucharist, being typical, needs to be *red*. Now chemists tell us that it is impossible to obtain a *red unfermented* wine without the aid of foreign ingredients or by boiling. Except in a very rare variety, the flesh of the grape is colourless. The colouring matter resides in the skin, and is in a fixed or insoluble condition, in which state the natural acids and juice of the fruit fail to extract it, and the moment alcohol produced by fermentation, which breaks up the cellular matter enclosing it, is present, it becomes soluble and yields its colour to the wine. It is possible, however, to obtain this colour by boiling. But those who assert that this was the old Jewish method are more ignorant than the merest child upon historical facts and practical wine manufacture. It may be here objected that there is a passage in Scripture condemnin red wine. This is a fair sample of the mischievous perversions of text^s indulged in by Prohibitionists. If *red* wines were condemned becau were necessarily intoxicating, why were not *white* wines condemned also ?

* The writer is indebted for much of the information in regard to this document to Mr. Sutton Sharp's article, "Moderation, or Total Abstinence," in the *Contemporary Review* for November, 1884.

White wines are principally made from the black grapes, and the juice drawn off early from the skins is permitted to ferment in a separate vessel, and these wines are invariably the sweetest, and strongest in alcoholic strength. But the fact is that there was a custom amongst ancient nations—as there is at the present time in Eastern countries—of mixing Indian hemp and other noxious drugs with the wine just previous to use, and which lent it a fiery red colour, a moving, sparkling motion like champagne, and a stupefying or maddening effect upon the system. The text is a warning against the “seeking out of mixed wine.”

Some of the methods of preparing the so-called “unfermented wines” might here be noted. In the majority of instances poor, thin clarets are subjected to distillation to get rid of the alcohol, sugar is added to sweeten and thicken, and elderberry to restore the colour partially destroyed by boiling. In others, the juice is boiled with sugar to a syrup, and *salicylic acid* added to prevent fermentation. In not a few instances which fell under the writer’s own observation, *cider*, sweetened and coloured, has been sold under the name of unfermented wine, and these samples contained a notable quantity of alcohol. These instances will give a fair idea of the sophisticated abominations that are sought to be forced upon the public under the cloak of religion and philanthropy. Quite recently a feminine lecturer declared that the time would come when “fermented” wine, “that last relic of *barbarism* and *immorality*, would be swept out of the churches.” And the writer is credibly informed that a reverend gentleman also hoped that the time would come when it would be a “criminal offence” to use fermented wines in the Sacrament. Nor is this language any more extravagant than consistency requires. Just so long as it is deemed necessary to use wine for the proper commemoration of the Saviour’s death,—and that will be while reason and Bible language lasts,—so long will it be impossible to get public opinion to regard moderate drinking as a sin *per se*.

As to the assertion that the majority of medical men favour the extreme position of the teetotallers the fact is the very reverse. The London *Lancet*, in a recent editorial upon the subject, says: “The intemperance of the teetotallers has greatly hindered the cause of temperance. Their denunciations of moderation and moderate drinking have estranged whole classes of men who would have brought strength and help to their cause. Their dogmatism about what constitutes food and what poison, and about the injurious effects of every drop of alcohol, has excited ridicule and laughter rather than intelligent interest. By such an attitude the medical profession has been prevented from co-operation with those who see in the drunkenness of the country a gigantic evil and disgrace to be remedied at any cost short of that of talking nonsense.”

Some of the absurdities which are equally untrue is the persistent quoting of Generals Wolseley and Gordon, Mr. Gladstone, Mr. Bright, the Graces, and others as total abstainers. In England, an Archdeacon quotes Hanlan as a bright and shining example of teetotalism! As for the late Dr. Carpenter, it is well known that he modified his views very greatly in regard to alcohol since he wrote his treatise of twenty years ago. In fact he found it impossible to do without a moderate amount of wine during the later years of his life. The whole mass of teetotal evi-

dence is on a par with the above, and is worthy only of a system which abolishes the word "temperance" from the Scriptures and substitutes the word "teetotalism."

I am not unmindful of the grievous effects of intemperance upon the individual and upon society; but that permanent or any good will result from talking nonsense and advocating communistic doctrines I cannot bring myself to believe. And I hope to see the time when true friends of temperance will turn their backs upon the common constable and join hands and hearts in a reformatory movement having for its mainspring Charity.





